

1000

Intimations.

ELECTRO-MEDICAL APPLIANCES.
For the cure of Nervous Diseases, Neuralgia, Rheumatism, Lumbago, etc.

MAGNETO-ELECTRIC MACHINES.
Very powerful, with multiplying wheels and magnetic indicator in Mahogany box.

SPAMER'S SINGLE AND DOUBLE CELL BATTERIES.

GAIFFE'S PORTABLE MEDICAL COIL.

SCOTT'S ELECTRIC HAIR-BRUSHES, TOOTH BRUSHES, etc.

ELASTIC STOCKINGS, LEGGINGS, KNEE-CAPS, ANKLETS AND BANDAGES.

SURGICAL AND MEDICAL APPLIANCES of all description at lowest rates.

DAKIN BROS. OF CHINA, LIMITED.
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL CHEMISTS,
QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL,
Opposite Hongkong Hotel.

(Telephone No. 60.)
Hongkong, 9th May, 1889.

FOR HOT CLIMATES.

WATSON'S EFFERVESCENT SALINE.

An effervescent preparation, forming when mixed with water a cooling and refreshing beverage, pleasant to the taste, and invaluable for maintaining the system in a healthy and natural condition.

It relieves Bilious Headaches, Feverishness, and Indigestion, and is especially recommended for sluggish and inactive Liver, Heartburn, Acidity, Scorbatic Eruptions, and Blisters on the Skin, &c.

It is an excellent Aperient, and forms a capital substitute for Seditive Powders.

In Bottles, 75 Cents each.

WATSON'S

FRUIT CORDIALS

PREPARED FROM THE JUICE OF THE FINEST SELECTED FRUIT. Make Delicious Summer Beverages.

RASPBERRY, STRAWBERRY, DAMSON, BLACK CURRANT, RED CURRANT, ORLEANS PLUM, PINEAPPLE, MORELLA CHERRY, LIME FRUIT, &c.

Price, 75 Cents per bottle.

WATSON'S

SPARKLING EFFERVESCENT CITRATE

OF **MAGNESIA**

When the body is in a heated or feverish condition, this preparation will be found most grateful, as it tends to produce a slight moisture on the skin, and cools the system generally.

It makes an agreeable Saline Draught, Antacid and mildly Aperient, preferable to any other Saline as a Febrifuge.

In Bottles, 50 Cents and \$1 each.

CAUTION.—Being prepared expressly for Hot Climates, parties requiring the same are advised to be particular to order WATSON'S EFFERVESCENT CITRATE OF MAGNESIA, MANY SO-CALLED similar preparations being acid and irritating to the Stomach and Bowels.

'SALT REGAL'
A NEW & MARVELLOUS DISCOVERY!
For the Prevention and Cure of

FEVER, CHOLERA, &c.
A Favorite Remedy at Home and Abroad.
An effervescent White Powder lately discovered which changes colour and develops OZONE—the principle of life.

Destroys Parasites and Fungoid growths in impure water, and directly affects Worms and Parasites in the system.

Price, \$1 per bottle.

A. S. WATSON & CO., LIMITED,
Sole Agents for
HONGKONG, CHINA AND MANILA.
HONGKONG DISPENSARY,
May, 1889.

The Hongkong Telegraph
HONGKONG, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1889.

One of the most practical solutions of the sanitary problem of the Colony lies, we think, in the extension of the town westwards, and in the building up of a sea-side suburb in the neighbourhood of Pokfulam, which is considered to be one of the healthiest localities in the Island.

The southwest monsoon is intended by nature as a compensation for the oppressive summer heat we experience in these latitudes. To forego its advantages, and substitute them by the artificial punkah, has so far been our mistaken policy. We have systematically preferred to roast in the northern slope of Victoria Peak to enjoying the breezes that sweep its southern shores throughout the whole length of the summer. Yet it would appear that no easier task could be found than that of extending the road which now reaches as far as Kennedy Town, round the base of Mount Davis, as far as Pokfulam, skirting the hills as near the sea as possible; an area might be embanked below the Reservoir, as large as Shamien in Canton, and a suburb built there, with gardens, with bathing piers, with waterfalls, and all other appliances of modern civilisation and comfort. A steam tramway line might be made to start from Kennedy Town, and, later on, brought on along the new reclamation, to the neighbourhood of the Clock Tower, and thus a great outlet would be found to the cramped condition of the City, as well as a great hygienic

measure adopted to cope with the present unsatisfactory sanitation of the colony. It will certainly be a pleasure to spend the summer months in Hongkong, when in half an hour's time the resident or visitor can transplant himself from a sweltering town to the cool breezes of the seaside, and spend an evening along the beach, with a vast horizon before him, and a steady wind blowing through his house. We have been in the habit of going across to Macao to enjoy some of these comforts. We forget that nature has abundantly provided us with sites infinitely more advantageous for summer resorts; and almost at our own gates. The Government would reap a substantial profit by undertaking the work alluded to, as the new reclaimed land would surely be taken up. But if Government is behind the times, we would recommend the plan to the enterprising men of Hongkong, as one of the most remunerative and practical that can be conceived.

TELEGRAMS.

OBITUARY.

LONDON, May 13th.
Father Damiet has died of leprosy at Molokai in the Sandwich Islands.

LOCAL AND GENERAL.

THE British sloop *Wanderer*, Commander Geo. A. Gilford, arrived to-day from Singapore.

THE P. & O. S. N. Co.'s extra steamer *Kashgar*, from Bombay, left Singapore for this port at 5.30 p.m. yesterday.

We note that Mr. J. J. Francis, Q.C., will deliver a lecture at the Literary Society to-morrow at 9.00 p.m. on "A Visit to Borneo."

We are informed that telegraphic advices have been received from the Punjom Mines to the effect that new lodes have recently been discovered.

ELDERLY GENT.—I am eighty years old, young man, and I don't recollect ever telling a lie. Young Man—Well, you can't expect your memory to be reliable at that age.

MRS. LANGTRY made her appearance on the stage at Philadelpha on Monday the 25th March in *Madeline*. Beyond a slight weakness, she showed no signs of her recent illness.

TWO mild-mannered men who possessed swords and revolvers but not licences were fined \$30 each this morning for having deadly weapons. What about some of the whisky in Queen's Road West?

THE composer of "Put me in my little bed" announces that he got two pounds for writing that interesting lyric, and hints that it was not enough. It was not; he ought to have got two years.

THE redoubtable Thaddeus O'Kane of Charters Towers, Queensland, now fills up the peaceful columns of the *Northern Miner* with corrections of the grammatical errors of his reptile contemporary.

THE widow of Marshal Prim, Donna Francisca Aguiar, has just died at Madrid, after three years' suffering. Since her husband's assassination she has lived in the strictest retirement, and during the last three years her reason has given way.

CITIZEN (to Uncle Rastus)—So that is the woman you are going to marry, is it, Uncle Rastus? Uncle Rastus—Yes, sah, dat am de lady. She yain't much to look at. Citizen—Well, no, not very much, Uncle Rastus. Uncle Rastus—But she hab got forty-seven dollars in de bank, boss, an' she hab promised ter gib me de power of attorney-generalship.

THE attendance at Madame Cora's entertainment in the City Hall last night was small and silent, as is generally the case here when anything under grand opera comes along. The performance in itself was excellent, the various feats of sleight of hand being remarkably neat in their execution, if not altogether novel. The concluding exhibition of thought-reading was especially good—it quite bewildered the Chinese spectators, and not a few of the Europeans. Altogether, Madame Cora very successfully sustained the interest of the entertainment for two hours.

It was not, says the *New York Sun*, until the time of William the Conqueror that oysters were eaten. In the year 1069, in the month of September, a younger son of an impoverished French family swam the channel to England. In clambering up some rocks out of the water—it was low tide—he put his hand on a stone, as he thought. The stone, however, closed upon his fingers, pinching them severely. With his trusty sword he forced the rock open and selected the Engers, which he put into his mouth to comfort. He tasted something so delicious that he forgot his pain. His hunger overcame his prudence, and he, though with fear, swallowed the moist mass that lay in the "stone" he had opened. It was an oyster and he was the first to eat one! We have forgotten the name of this hero, but are not his deeds related in *Beacon's Annual* for 1865? They are of a verity. Really, though, oysters have been eaten since the time of the Greeks and Romans.

THUS the *Sydney Bulletin*—A sorrowful specimen of humanity signing himself "A.H.M." writes to the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* concerning the failure of "Captain Swift" in Sydney. "Your correspondent 'Truth' and 'Swagman' in calling the piece 'dreary' and 'only a partial success from a literary point of view,' disregard entirely with the London and Sydney press and themselves as critics above the Prince of Wales," says A.H.M. "I never saw a piece I enjoyed so much. Surely H.R.H. has seen more of the stage than for 40 years has seen more of a superior Wales, and yet, if he were quoted as a superior authority, the fair of 'A.H.M.' would probably stand up. For which, and several other reasons, we ask 'A.H.M.' to form his own opinions, and not borrow them from an heir-apparent who has very few to spare.

An Emergency meeting of St. John Lodge, No. 618, S.C., will be held in Freemasons' Hall, Zealand Street, on Friday, the 17th instant, at 8.30 for 9 p.m. precisely. Visiting brethren are cordially invited.

PRIVATE Alexander Smith, of the Ninety-ninth, is a Bad Egg. He got fined the other day for being pugnaciously full, and now he has been sent down in Ship-Street, having a royal row with a China girl. Mr. Pollock sent him up for six weeks, this morning, with another month on the top of it if he didn't pay the damsel \$10 cumshaw.

SHIP-OWNER—Has the *Dolphin* sailed for the west coast of Africa, John? Clerk—No, sir. Ship-owner—She hasn't? Those confounded missionaries have delayed her, I suppose! Clerk—No, sir; the missionaries are all right. They're aboard. Ship-owner—What's the trouble, then? Clerk—There's a strike at the distillery and the rum hasn't come down yet.

REFERRING to His Excellency the Governor, "Brownie" in the *China Mail* of Saturday last says:—"That perhaps his *tailcoat* caused him to be somewhat ungracious in his condemnation of the repeal of the C. D. Acts." The letters "Brownie's," not ours, and we should like to know what they are actually intended to convey. If this 'fragrant murmur' is meant as a witicism, it is worthy of its author; if it is a *double entendre*, it is also coarse and vulgar, and altogether lacking in point; and if it conveys nothing beyond the ordinary meaning of the words used, we can only characterise it as the idle chatter of a buffoon.

IF there is any demand for a roomy grave with nice high railings and cornice, and a bell on the front door, and green venetian blinds that can be let down when the remains are not at home—if any one wants a quiet and select sepulchre, with no low downmen buried close at hand, and no coarse, uneducated dead in too close vicinity—let him look at this advertisement cut from the *London Bazaar*—

Highbury Cemetery, private grave, newly fitted with granite headstone, freestone base, iron rail, young girl only interred therein. Price very low.

Poor little girl! For sale along with the grave—price very low! It is rough on her, anyhow. If her ghost takes in the papers and sees her dust in the market how must she feel about it? The granite headstone, and the freestone base, and the iron rail are not of much account, but we would like to see the animal who has a little girl's grave for sale, and ask him what he thinks of himself, and how much he'll take for his own sepulchre when he is deposited in one and his commercial soul is stumbling over open drains and dodging ash-heaps on its way to another land.

News reached here to-day to the effect that Mr. H. Norman, the *Pall Mall Gazette* travelling correspondent, had been successful in shooting a tiger at the Telegraph Station, Cape St. James, where he landed from the last outgoing French mail. It appears that whilst Mr. Norman was enjoying a quiet rubber the monarch of the jungle came to interview him (a not unfrequent occurrence there) when the hunter, nothing daunted, from behind the bars and venetians of the verandah, fired his celebrated six shooter, and plugged the beast in the eye rolling him over on the spot. Naturally this achievement has created intense excitement at Cape St. James, and really it nearly equals the feat of our *Amoy* *shikaris* who by cautiously approaching their big game (the Chinese hunter a gorged or semi-comatose condition) generally manage to bag them. Now is the time for our military Q.C., who prides himself on being so great an authority on guns, getting out his little weapon and firing off the one which has been seen in the neighbourhood of Macao, a place to which he is so partial. Surely Mr. J. J. Francis will not let one of the fourth estate cut him out in this fashion.

BARON VON KNIGGE (died 1796), the author of the well known work, "People I have Known," occupied in his younger days the post of Recorder at Hesse-Cassel. He was a general favourite in society on account of his brilliant wit, but so numerous were the victims of his satirical humour that on his approach everyone involuntarily stood on the defensive. It thus frequently happened that Knigge was paid back in his own coin. One day the papers reported, with reference to the military disturbances in Turkey, that the Mussulmans at Constantinople had, on the 10th of May, by way of propitiating the great Prophet, buried a Jew by the side of an ass. This piece of intelligence created general amusement, and Knigge, who was sitting amid a gay circle of ladies of the court, called out to Feidel, the highly respected Jewish purveyor, who was present: "Ho, lucky Feidel, that you were not in Constantinople on the 10th of May!" "Certainly," the old gentleman replied, with a shake of his head, "very lucky for me, but it was equally fortunate for you that you were not there, Herr Baron." "For me? How's that?" "I am not a Jew!" was the startled reply. "No, indeed," said Feidel, "without moving a muscle of his face," but the Herr Baron forgets that besides the Jew another party was buried." This repartee, uttered, as it was, with the most delightful gallantry, was received by the company with deafening shouts of laughter, whereupon our defeated wag so completely lost his head that he fled from the room in a towering passion.

PROBABLY not one citizen in a hundred, says a writer in the *New York Commercial Advertiser*, has ever heard the word "champerly" before the twenty-five lawyers who had been suing the elevated railroad were accused of that obscure crime before the Grand Jury on Thursday. Readers of current news now have a tolerably clear idea that champerly is the act of aiding a person in the prosecution of a lawsuit, under an agreement to share in the proceeds of the litigation or to make some profit from it. The law is an inheritance from an old English statute of Henry VIII's time, and like many other laws of similar origin, it aimed against a really objectionable practice, but unfortunately covers by its terms other perfectly proper legal methods. It has proved difficult for the legal interpretation to separate the efforts of a lawyer to arrange for a suit with a "contingent fee" from enterprises of the Dodson & Fogg order. Hence the law has become practically obsolete, and in many States has been formally abolished by act of Legislature. The defendants in the present case are accused by the railroad company of inducing property owners along the line of the elevated railroad to sue for damages, and agreeing to draw the legal fees from the expected indemnity. Will, therefore, be of interest, not only to the profession, but to the laity, the necessary adherence of the courts to obsolete English statutes has had more than one question result in modern practice. In the year 1838 an Englishman, under trial for his own country for murder, astonished the Court by solemnly offering to submit the case to a *wager of battle*. "The lawyers were incredulous, but examination of the old statutes showed that the defendant had the right to his claim, and was entitled to settle the matter by a *wager of battle*," says the *London Standard*, "and the presence of the Court, from whence the appearance of the defendant was started. No champion offered, himself and the accused was accordingly discharged."

THE Electric sugar windlers are under \$11,000 ball each at New York.

MISS KATE FIELD—I had called to see the religious editor. As the great American champion of California wine as a solution of the temperance problem, I sent him a case of the wine, with a request for a strong article on the subject in the religious department, but the article has not appeared. Office Boy—No, ma'am; he's drunk yet.

A WILFUL Mistake on the Major's Part.—Widow (with marriageable girls): "Julia has a most lovely voice, Major—so powerful, you know; but for singing, silver tones give me my second daughter." Would you like to hear her sing "Some Day"? Major (awfully bored): "Certainly, Delighted, I'm sure. Let's say some day not month; that is—er—unless I'm unexpectedly ordered away anywhere."

THE following are the Orders of the Day for the meeting of the Legislative Council to be held to-morrow, the 16th inst., at 4 p.m.:

1. First reading of a Bill entitled "An Ordinance for the naturalization of Li Man Hi, otherwise Poleshan."
2. First reading of a Bill to amend Ordinance 17 of 1887, (The Cattle Diseases, Slaughter-Houses and Markets Ordinance, 1887.)
3. First reading of a Bill to amend "The Post Office Ordinance, 1887."
4. First reading of a Bill entitled "The Crown Lands Resumption Ordinance, 1889."
5. Second reading of the Bill entitled "The Chinese Extradition Ordinance, 1889."

OUR Sydney Bulletin friend relates how at Benalla (VIC) the other day, an aged man, bowed with the weight of his years, and bald from repeated marriages, was hauled into the local police court and shored up in a safe place whilst a bow-legged constable who had grown hoarse, and asthmatic, and ugly in the service, proceeded, with measured speech and slow, to charge him with stealing an eighteen-shilling saddle in some far-off time when Moses was young, and the *Depridolon Lintops* skipped airily across the face of the continent, and the junk of the awed Mongol came up from the sea in solitary majesty. The constable could call no witnesses, because everybody who knew anything about the saddle was dead, and wouldn't come if he called at his last abode, and being beyond the jurisdiction of the court, and not caring a cuss if they were convicted of contempt, The man who owned the saddle was dead, and his posterity had gone out of history and left no documentary evidence regarding the saddle and no legitimate issue to inherit the lawsuit. The saddle itself had been worn out, riding from Dan to Beersheba with Her Majesty's mail before Cobb's coaches took up the route, and the man who made it was drowned chasing Moses across the Red Sea on a bicycle; consequently there was no proof beyond the word of the prosecuting constable that there had ever been any saddle in the case at all, and the aged man should not be merely a common charge of unbecoming behaviour "as learning me uniform," and he was not sure after all that he had not dreamed about the affair, but seemed to incline to the belief that the Bench should make it a caution to prisoner, anyhow. After mature deliberation the Bench solemnly decided that the man who lost the saddle ought to have been embalmed in order to enable him to appear in evidence, also that Moses should have been subpoenaed and the saddle-maker bound over to appear, and a copy of Josephus' works retained for the Crown; but, as things had been neglected, they had no option but to discharge the prisoner without a stain on his character, whilst complimenting the constable on his intelligence and zeal.

SUPREME COURT.

IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

(Before Mr. A. G. Wise, Acting Puisne Judge.)

THE SHAREBROKING CASE.

The case of Sampson v. Fenwick came on this morning. Mr. G. S. Coxon was called. He said:—I am a broker, and have been in seven years. I know the custom of the so-called Stock Exchange here, I have never been connected with the floating of a company, and do not know any broker who has except in this instance. I am a shareholder in Messrs. Fenwick & Co. I got my shares through Mr. Sampson. I heard he had to do with the disposing of the shares, and so I went to him. I did not hear that all shares applied for through him were to be allotted—at least I do not recollect him saying so. I only got a portion of those I applied for. I do not know what a broker would get on shares in a case like this.

Mr. E. George—I am a stock and share-broker of fourteen years' standing. I consider myself able to give an opinion on sharebroking, or do anything you might put in my way. If I had been called on to promote a company I think that one per cent. would be a moderate charge. I have never floated a company. If I were asked to turn a private business into a company I should charge brokerage on the shares unless there was a special arrangement. The charge is a quarter per cent. on ten dollar shares, half per cent. on \$50 shares, and so on.

By Mr. Hastings—I have never known these brokerage charges to be made upon obtaining applications for shares. The charges are not uniform. If a number of brokers sent in applications for shares in a new company they could only charge on the number allotted.

By Mr. Webster—That would apply equally to a case where only one broker was employed. Mr. John Andrew—I am a broker here. I have never taken part in floating a company. I have been a shareholder in Fenwick & Co. I applied for a hundred shares and got seventy-five. I got them through Mr. Sampson. He told me to put my name down for as many as I wanted. I expected to get a hundred, from what he said. If I had been asked to obtain applications for shares in a new company I should expect to get brokerage on each application. I should expect fifty cents a share. I should still expect it if there were three or four thousand shares.

By Mr. Hastings—I have applied for shares in other companies and only got part, but I have on occasion got all, as an original applicant. I do not think it is usual to cut down the number when they are vendible privately. I understood from Mr. Sampson that I should get a hundred.

By Mr. Webster—It was not the same as if it was advertised in the papers. Mr. Hastings, opening the case for the defence, submitted that the plaintiff was not the promoter of the Company, and had no claim to title—he performed none of the duties and accepted none of the responsibilities. His only character was that of an agent for the distribution of the shares—a canvasser for them. It was admitted that he did certain services, in that capacity, so the only question really before the Court was as to the remuneration he was entitled to, whether he was entitled, as he contended, to one per cent. on the whole of the shares, including the defendant's 800, or as an alternative, to fifty cents a share on the whole of the application, and in that behalf, or whether the contention of the defendant was right, and he

was only entitled to one per cent. brokerage on the number of shares allotted on those applications. It would be shown in evidence that the amount paid into the Court represented the amount due in the latter case, and he submitted that that was the only practical and workable rule to apply to such cases. Mr. Fenwick utterly denied having promised to allot all the shares Mr. Sampson's clients might ask for, and also the assertion that he gave Mr. Sampson power to place the whole four thousand shares where he liked.

Mr. Fenwick was then called. He said:—I am the general manager of George Fenwick and Co., Limited. Sometime ago I was desirous of forming my business into a company, and I went to my solicitors and had a prospectus and memorandum of purchase drawn up. All the preliminaries were settled before the 28th February, on which day I accidentally met Mr. Sampson. I told him I thought of making my business into a company, and gave him the draft articles of association. He asked me if I had any friends who would like to take shares. He said "Oh, let me put this through for you," and I said "All right," as it would save me some trouble. I had previously spoken to some people, who had agreed to take shares. I showed him a list of their names. I told him not to make the matter public. I met him again a few days afterwards, and he said he had done nothing, as he did not care to mention it since I did not want it made public. He also told me he had ordered a hundred copies of the prospectus to be printed. I saw the proof, and he corrected it in some unimportant particulars. On the 5th March all the shares had been applied for, and a large number of applications, and he had difficulty in floating the Company. I did not give Mr. Sampson to understand that all applications made through him would be granted; I told one man about that time that was not so. One individual offered to take up all the shares not applied for, but I told him it could not be done—it would not be in the interests of the Company. I continued to receive applications and gave Mr. Sampson the names, which he made into an alphabetical list and gave to Messrs. Wotton and Deacon. That practically finished his work. I have gone through the list of shareholders, and divided the shares allotted through me and through him. [There were 1671 allotted to him and his clients. That makes \$47, at one per cent. The shares were allotted on the 15th March. I allotted them as I liked, in the best interests of the Company. Mr. Sampson sent in his bill on the 31st March; I had asked him to do so. I did not give him 400 shares to place; my idea was to place that number privately and then advertise the rest, but that did not need to be done.

By Mr. Webster—I did not engage Mr. Sampson as a sort of confidential agent; I engaged him as an assistant to place the shares. I did not employ any other broker. It was on the list Mr. Sampson prepared that I allotted the shares. There were more than 6,000 shares applied for, according to that list when it was handed in by Mr. Sampson. I did not speak to Mr. Sampson when I heard he had been promising his clients that they should get all the shares they applied for. Mr. Sampson told me on the last day that he could place the remaining 1,200 shares with one man. I did not say he could not have them because he would then have 1,900 shares. I remember Mr. Sampson saying he didn't care ten cents who got the shares as long as he got the brokerage. This concluded the case for the defence.

Mr. Haings, in summing up, again criticised Mr. Sampson's claims to be considered a promoter of the Company. To be that, he must have held a fiduciary position with regard to the Company, and be responsible for the statements in the prospectus, being liable to return all profits if those statements were found to be misleading. Mr. Sampson had no such liability. If the prospectus had been found to be misleading, and an action brought against him, he would simply have set up the defence that he was only the agent for the distribution of the shares. The only question was what remuneration he should have for his services. Mr. Haings, in his opening remarks, said that he would prove the custom in the matter, and certain gentlemen belonging to the stockbroking fraternity had been called to do so, but none of them knew of any case where brokerage had been paid to a man for canvassing for applications—there was no custom in Hongkong in the matter. Therefore they must look at the amount of work done, the skill required, and the responsibility incurred. The work was all done between the 28th February and the following Tuesday, probably all that Mr. Sampson had to do was to stand in front of the Hongkong Hotel, where brokers most do congregate, and take down the names of the people who wanted shares. He (Mr. Hastings) had very great doubts as to the beginning of the case as to whether the plaintiff was entitled to brokerage at all, or whether he was not entitled to be paid so much a day—say \$25, or something like that—but Mr. Fenwick desired to deal generously with him, and give him a percentage on every allotted share placed by him. No special skill was required, and no responsibility. He left the case to his Lordship as a better judge of what was a reasonable amount than the gentlemen who had given evidence.

There were interested witnesses in the highest degree, and to whom it would be a great advantage to have a rule laid down in that Court deciding that they must be paid on the number of applications they sent in, and not the allotment. He asked his Lordship to decide that the amount paid into Court was ample.

Mr. Webster, in reply, said that they were agreed as to the facts—the only difference lay in the question of the amount the plaintiff earned. There was no express arrangement as to what he should receive, but it was plain that he was retained as a sort of private agent, not as a broker, and that he had in his capacity as a broker, to obtain applications for shares—these words of the defendant—"to save me the trouble of coming up to town." It was implied, therefore, in the absence of an agreement, that the plaintiff was to be paid in the usual way as a broker.

Mr. Hastings—Innocently enough, perhaps, had estimated the value of a broker's work at \$25 a day, and made out that the plaintiff was only at work two days, although as a matter of fact he was employed over the affairs of the Company at least a fortnight, during which time, according to the evidence of Mr. Danby, he was very busy indeed. It was clear that he was from the fact that he obtained applications for over three thousand shares. He submitted in conclusion, that his client had established his right to the sum originally claimed, and therefore to the lesser amount.

His Lordship, in delivering judgment, having briefly stated the nature of the claim, said that he did not think it mattered whether the work done was called remuneration or brokerage. Plaintiff had evidently been at considerable difficulty to find out how to assess his remuneration; he had first based it on a percentage of the shares, and then on the usual charge of 50 cents per share. In either case it was over \$1,000, but it had been reduced to bringing it within the jurisdiction of the Court. The defendant treated it differently. It could have been decided by custom, as Mr. Webster justly observed, but that was not the precedent of the sort established here. He proposed, therefore, to grant a lump sum which he thought fair and reasonable for the services rendered. That services had been rendered was admitted by the payment into Court of \$420, so that the sole question was as to the amount.

Mr. Fenwick was then called. He said:—I am the general manager of George Fenwick and Co., Limited. Sometime ago I was desirous of forming my business into a company, and I went to my solicitors and had a prospectus and memorandum of purchase drawn up. All the preliminaries were settled before the 28th February, on which day I accidentally met Mr. Sampson. I told him I thought of making my business into a company, and gave him the draft articles of association. He asked me if I had any friends who would like to take shares. He said "Oh, let me put this through for you," and I said "All right," as it would save me some trouble. I had previously spoken to some people, who had agreed to take shares. I showed him a list of their names. I told him not to make the matter public. I met him again a few days afterwards, and he said he had done nothing, as he did not care to mention it since I did not want it made public. He also told me he had ordered a hundred copies of the prospectus to be printed. I saw the proof, and he corrected it in some unimportant particulars. On the 5th March all the shares had been applied for, and a large number of applications, and he had difficulty in floating the Company. I did not give Mr. Sampson to understand that all applications made through him would be granted; I told one man about that time that was not so. One individual offered to take up all the shares not applied for, but I told him it could not be done—it would not be in the interests of the Company. I continued to receive applications and gave Mr. Sampson the names, which he made into an alphabetical list and gave to Messrs. Wotton and Deacon. That practically finished his work. I have gone through the list of shareholders, and divided the shares allotted through me and through him. [There were 1671 allotted to him and his clients. That makes \$47, at one per cent. The shares were allotted on the 15th March. I allotted them as I liked, in the best interests of the Company. Mr. Sampson sent in his bill on the 31st March; I had asked him to do so. I did not give him 400 shares to place; my idea was to place that number privately and then advertise the rest, but that did not need to be done.

tion. He was the principle that was enough or not. That being the principle on which he would act, it was necessary to decide, if there had been an agreement between the parties that all shares applied for through the plaintiff should be allotted, or not. The evidence was conflicting, but it did not make any difference. One witness called for the plaintiff fixed the amount of remuneration at something like \$3,000, but his Lordship did not agree with him—he might think his time very valuable, but that was a very large amount. Having given his best consideration to the subject, and in view of the number of shares allotted, he was prepared to allow \$750, which was to say the sum paid into Court plus the difference between that and \$720, with costs.

Mr. Hastings submitted, with regard to costs, that the witnesses for the plaintiff were not material—their evidence was irrelevant, and the defendant ought not to be called upon to pay their expenses.

His Lordship said that was a matter for the Taxing Master.

Mr. Webster agreed. Mr. Hastings could review the taxation if he liked.

His Lordship—Certainly.

FENWICK & CO., LIMITED.

The first statutory meeting of the shareholders in this company was held in the Hongkong Hotel this afternoon. Mr. Fullerton Henderson presided, and there were present—Messrs. George Fenwick (general manager), A. Woolley, G. F. Stevens, and H. Harms.

The Chairman said that as it was simply the statutory meeting required by the Companies Ordinance there was nothing to report, but any questions would be willingly answered.—There being none.

Mr. Fenwick stated that the business was progressing as satisfactorily as was anticipated, and he thought they might safely look forward to an interim dividend of five per cent. at the end of the six months.

That concluded the business.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We do not necessarily endorse the opinions expressed by our correspondents in this column.]

THE PUNJOM BOOM.

SIR—A short time before the Punjom "boom" was at its height, a cleverly and carefully worded letter from a correspondent in your widely circulated journal had made the Hongkong public believe that many agreeable surprises were in store for the Punjom investors. In plain words, your correspondent meant to convey that millions of dollars would be forthcoming by the out-pit of gold from the mines. I beseech your correspondent to now come forth boldly before the public, and say in plain and unadorned language, whether any scientific demonstration or practical results attained till now, justify his rosy-colored assertions. Let us state statements, and roseate chimeras, and elaborate upon the brain of an Utopian philosopher be left out of our calculation; solid and logical proofs should be forthcoming, or must we conclude that he used the public press simply for the purpose of working up the "boom" in its highest pitch to satisfy his *sacra stultitiae*? If that was his object, his efforts to shake off pagoda trees must not have proved an upset, and he is to be congratulated on the decisive victory scored

